IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

PERSONALIZED USER MODEL, L.L.P.,)	
Plaint	iff,)	
v.)	C.A. No. 09-525 (JJF)
GOOGLE, INC.,)	
Defen	dant.)	

PLAINTIFF PERSONALIZED USER MODEL, L.L.P.'S ANSWER TO DEFENDANT GOOGLE, INC.'S COUNTERCLAIMS

Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant Personalized User Model, LLP ("P.U.M."), in answer to the Counterclaims of Defendant Google, Inc. ("Google") filed with this Court on September 8, 2009, states:

Parties

- 1. P.U.M. admits the allegations set forth in paragraph 1 of Google's Counterclaims on information and belief.
- 2. P.U.M. denies that P.U.M. is a "corporation" and states it is a limited liability partnership. P.U.M. otherwise admits the allegations set forth in paragraph 2 of Google's Counterclaims.

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 3. P.U.M. admits the allegations set forth in paragraph 3 of Google's Counterclaims.
- 4. P.U.M. denies that the interests and convenience of the parties, the public, and the courts would be better served by transferring this case to the Northern District of California. P.U.M. otherwise admits the allegations set forth in paragraph 4 of Google's Counterclaims.

COUNT I: Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '040 Patent

5. As to the allegations set forth in paragraph 5 of Google's Counterclaims, P.U.M. incorporates by reference each of its responses to paragraphs 1 through 4 above, and

does not respond to the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 14 of Google's Answer, incorporated by reference in the Counterclaims, as no response is required.

- 6. P.U.M. admits the allegations set forth in paragraph 6 of Google's Counterclaims.
- 7. P.U.M. admits the allegations set forth in paragraph 7 of Google's Counterclaims.
- 8. P.U.M. denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 8 of Google's Counterclaims.

COUNT II: Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '031 Patent

- 9. As to the allegations set forth in paragraph 9 of Google's Counterclaims, P.U.M. incorporates by reference each of its responses to paragraphs 1 through 8 above, and does not respond to the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 14 of Google's Answer, incorporated by reference in the Counterclaims, as no response is required.
- 10. P.U.M. admits the allegations set forth in paragraph 10 of Google's Counterclaims.
- 11. P.U.M. admits the allegations set forth in paragraph 11 of Google's Counterclaims.
- 12. P.U.M. denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 12 of Google's Counterclaims.

COUNT III: Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity and/or Unenforceability of the '040 Patent

- 13. As to the allegations set forth in paragraph 13 of Google's Counterclaims, P.U.M. incorporates by reference each of its responses to paragraphs 1 through 12 above, and does not respond to the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 14 of Google's Answer, incorporated by reference in the Counterclaims, as no response is required.
- 14. P.U.M. denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 14 of Google's Counterclaims.

COUNT IV: Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity and/or Unenforceability of the '031 Patent

- 15. As to the allegations set forth in paragraph 15 of Google's Counterclaims, P.U.M. incorporates by reference each of its responses to paragraphs 1 through 14 above, and does not respond to the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 14 of Google's Answer, incorporated by reference in the Counterclaims, as no response is required.
- 16. P.U.M. denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 16 of Google's Counterclaims.

EXCEPTIONAL CASE

17. P.U.M. denies the allegations set forth in paragraph 17 of Google's Counterclaims.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant P.U.M. respectfully requests that the relief Google requests be denied and that P.U.M. be granted the following relief with respect to Google's Counterclaims:

- 1. That judgment be entered in favor of P.U.M. on each of Google's Counterclaims, and that Google take nothing by reason of its Counterclaims;
- 2. That P.U.M. be awarded its attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred in defense of Google's Counterclaims; and
 - 3. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP

OF COUNSEL:

Marc S. Friedman SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP 1221 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10020-1089 (212) 768-6700

Jimmy M. Shin Yar R. Chaikovsky Jennifer D. Bennett SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP 1530 Page Mill Road, Ste. 200 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1125 (650) 798-0300

September 30, 2009 3134721

Karen Jacobs Londen (#2881)
Jeremy A. Tigan (#5239)
1201 N. Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19899-1347
(302) 658-9200
klouden@mnat.com
jtigan@mnat.com
Attorneys for Personalized User Model, L.L.P.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 30, 2009, I caused the foregoing to be electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF which will send electronic notification of such filing to all registered participants.

Additionally, I hereby certify that true and correct copies of the foregoing were caused to be served on September 30, 2009 upon the following individuals in the manner indicated:

BY E-MAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

Richard L. Horwitz
David E. Moore
D. Fon Muttamara-Walker
POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP
1313 N. Market St., 6th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801
rhorwitz@potternanderson.com
dmoore@potteranderson.com
fmuttamara-walker@potteranderson.com

BY E-MAIL

Brian C. Cannon
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER
& HEDGES, LLP
briancannon@quinnemanuel.com

Charles K. Verhoeven
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER
& HEDGES, LLP
charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com

David A. Perlson
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER
& HEDGES, LLP
davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com

Antonio R. Sistos QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER & HEDGES, LLP antoniosistos@quinnemanuel.com

Eugene Novik
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER
& HEDGES, LLP
eugenenovikov@quinnemanuel.com

Jeremy A. Tigan (#5239)